

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/837,992	04/18/2001	Hui Tian	18781-006020	8880
20350	7590 06/16/2004	EXAMINER		INER
	D AND TOWNSEND AN RCADERO CENTER	FRONDA, CHRISTIAN L		
EIGHTH FLO		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRANC	CISCO, CA 94111-3834		1652	
			DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No	Applicantic			
4 .				Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comme		09/837,9	92	TIAN ET AL.			
C	Office Action Summary	Examine		Art Unit			
		Christian		1652			
The Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this commun ply	nication appears on th	e cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
A SHORTI THE MAIL - Extensions after SIX (6) - If the period - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD ING DATE OF THIS COMMUN of time may be available under the provision MONTHS from the mailing date of this com for reply specified above, the maximum sply within the set or extended period for replecived by the Office later than three months nt term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evenunication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and wy will, by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tir utory minimum of thirty (30) day ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from dication to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. If the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)⊠ Resi	consive to communication(s) fil	ed on 21 Mav 2004.					
· <u> </u>	This action is FINAL . 2b) \boxtimes This action is non-final.						
*	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition o	f Claims						
4a) C 5)∭ Claii 6)⊠ Claii 7)∭ Claii	m(s) <u>1-11,13-15,17-74,76 and 1</u> Of the above claim(s) <u>19-30 and 19-30 and </u>	d 33-74 is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
9) <u></u> The s	specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner.					
10)⊠ The o Appli Repl	drawing(s) filed on 18 April 200 cant may not request that any objected to drawing sheet(s) including the or declaration is objected to	$\underline{1}$ is/are: a) \square accepte ection to the drawing(s) I g the correction is require	be held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) D Notice of D	eferences Cited (PTO-892) raftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P				
)/Mail Date	- ,	6) Other:	,			

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on November 19, 2003, has been entered.
- 2. Claims 1-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 31, 32, 76, and 77 are under consideration in this Office Action.
- 3. The rejection of claims 1-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 31, 32, 76, and 77 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn since Applicants' arguments filed 05/21/2004 are deemed persuasive to overcome the utility rejection.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 2 is objected to because they recite non-elected subject matter, specifically, SEQ ID NOS: 5 and 6. Applicant is required to cancel the claims or amend the claims to recite the elected subject matter of SEQ ID NO: 3 and SEQ ID NO: 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

- 5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 6. Claims 1-8, 10, 13-15, 17, 18, 31, 32, 76, and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an isolated polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:3 or an isolated polynucleotide comprising SEQ ID NO: 4; does not reasonably provide enablement for any other

embodiment.

Applicants'arguments filed 05/21/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants' position is that the specification demonstrates how to make the claimed invention since the human SSG nucleotide sequence SEQ ID NO: 3 and the mouse SSG nucleotide sequence SEQ ID NO: 1 encode polypeptides that share 78% identity between their respective amino acid sequences shown in Exhibit B. Applicants argue that the specification teaches hybridization and amplification techniques that can be used to identify the claimed invention in DNA libraries or expression libraries. The Examiner disagrees for reasons of record and reasons stated below.

Teachings regarding screening and searching for the claimed invention using hybridization or PCR techniques is not guidance for making the claimed invention. Sequence identity is not a disclosure of how to make the claimed invention since sequence identity only indicates what percentage of nucleotides or amino acid residues are identical to a reference nucleotide or amino acid sequence. Sequence identity of SEQ ID NO: 4 to the *Drosophila brown* gene is not a disclosure that the claimed invention automatically has the properties or characteristics of the *Drosophila brown* gene. Furthermore, sequence identity is not teaching regarding the specific nucleotides to change in any polynucleotide to make the claimed polypeptide.

The specification provides guidance and examples for making an isolated polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:3 or an isolated polynucleotide comprising SEQ ID NO: 4. However, the specification does not teach the specific amino acids and codons that can be altered to make the claimed polynucleotide that encodes a polypeptide that has 75%, 80%, 90%, or 95% identical to SEQ ID NO: 3 and still retains ABC sterol transporter activity. The specification does not teach the specific nucleotides that can be altered to make the claimed polynucleotide that has 80% identity to SEQ ID NO: 4.

The state of the art as exemplified by Attwood et al. (Comput. Chem. 2001, Vol. 25(4), pp. 329-39) is such that:

"...we do not have a common understanding of what constitutes a gene; we cannot invariably say that a particular sequence or fold has arisen via divergence or convergence; we do not fully understand the rules of protein folding, so we cannot predict protein structure; and we cannot invariably diagnose protein function, given knowledge only of its sequence or structure in isolation" (see Abstract and entire publication).

The standard for meeting the enablement requirement is whether one of skill in the art can make the invention without undue experimentation. The amount of experimentation to make the claimed polynucleotide is enormous and entails selecting specific nucleotides to change (deletion, insertion, substitution, or combinations thereof) in a polynucleotide to make a

polynucleotide that encodes a polypeptide that comprises an amino acid sequence that is at least 75%, 80%, 90%, or 95% identical to SEQ ID NO: 3 and determining by assays whether the polypeptide has ABC sterol transporter activity. Furthermore, such undue experimentation entails screening and searching for any polynucleotide that hybridizes to SEQ ID NO:4 under the moderately stringent hybridization conditions recited in claim 8, expressing the polynucleotide to make a polypeptide, and then determining by assays whether the polypeptide has ABC sterol transporter activity

Thus, such enormous experimentation is well outside the realm of routine experimentation and predictability in the art of success in determining whether the resulting polypeptide has activity is extremely low since no information is provided by the specification regarding the specific amino acid residues of the encoded ABC sterol transporter which cannot be changed in order preserve activity.

The Examiner finds that one skilled in the art would require additional guidance, such as information regarding the specific amino acid residues which must be preserved to maintain ABC sterol transporter activity. Without such a guidance, the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is undue. Claims 2-8, 10, 13-15, 17, 18, 31, 32, 76, 77 which depend from claim 1 are also rejected because they do not correct the defect of claim 1.

7. Claims 1-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 31, 32, 76, and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants' arguments filed 05/21/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants' position is that the amendment to the claims overcomes the rejection since the amendments define a particular structure and function. The Examiner disagrees for reasons of record and reasons stated below.

The claims are genus claims which are directed to any isolated nucleic acid encoding any SSG polypeptide comprising any amino acid sequence that is at least 75%, 80%, 90%, or 95% identical to SEQ ID NO: 3, any isolated nucleic acid comprising a nucleotide sequence at least about 80% identical to SEQ ID NO: 4, or any nucleic acid which hybridizes under moderately stringent or stringent hybridization conditions to SEQ ID NO: 4.

The specification defines "SSG polypeptide" as a transporter with the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 3, or any derivative, homolog, or fragment thereof. The specification does not provide a written description of the specific function and structure of any derivative, homolog, or fragment thereof as encompassed by the term "SSG polypeptide".

The recitation that the polypeptide comprises an ATP-binding cassette (ABC) family sterol transporter does not limit the claimed genus to a genus encompassing only nucleic acids

encoding ABC family sterol transporters since the recitation of "SSG polypeptide" encompasses any derivative, homolog, or fragment of a transporter polypeptide with the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 3

Applicants have failed to sufficiently describe the claimed invention, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention. Claims 2-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 31, 32, 76, and 77 which depend from claim 1 are also rejected because they do not correct the defect of claim 1.

Amending the claims to recite that the phrase, "an isolated nucleic acid encoding an ATP-binding cassette (ABC) family sterol transporter", may overcome the rejection.

Conclusion

- 8. No claim is allowed.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian L Fronda whose telephone number is (571)272-0929. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday between 9:00AM 5:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura N Achutamurthy can be reached on (571)272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CLF

PONNATHARUACHUZAMARTHY SUPERABORY PARTA TARABRA YEORGOLOGY (1991) IN 1990